THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVII OCTOBER, 1944 No. 292

Editorial

DR PARKES takes the whole question of the relation between the Church and the Synagogue to a deep level, and Fr Gillet follows him there. They are not discussing whether Christian missions to the Jews ought to be modified or can be improved in one way or another. Dr Parkes is asking whether the "missionary" approach to the Jews is after all the right one, and whether it is not due to a false theology. Ought not the break between the Church and the Synagogue to be regarded as a schism within the Israel of God? And, if so, ought not Christian-Jewish relations to be brought within the scope of the reunion or ecumenical movement?

Christians and Jews have a common ancestry. The traditions by which both live stem from the Hebrew Bible. We may recall Léon Bloy's moving witness to this from the Christian side: "Suppose that people about you were to speak continually of your father and your mother with the greatest contempt, and to have for them only insults or outrageous sarcasms, what would be your sentiments? Well, that is exactly what is happening to our Lord Jesus Christ. We forget, or rather we do not wish to know, that as a man our Lord was a Jew, the epitome *par excellence* of the Jewish nature, the Lion of Judah; that His Mother was a Jewess, the flower of the Jewish race; that the apostles were Jews, along with all the prophets; finally, that our whole liturgy is based on Jewish books. How, then, can we express the enormity of the outrage and the blasphemy involved in vilifying the Jewish race?"[1] Christians and Jews belong together and are one people, in a way that Christians and Hindus or Buddhists are not. The separation between them is more like the separation between long sundered branches of a family than the gulf between the Church and the non-Christian religions. Is not this way of viewing the matter in accord with St Paul's testimony in the Epistle to the Romans about the mystery of Israel?

It is at present more important and more fitting to establish dialogues between the Church and the Synagogue than "missions" from one to the other. They have grown very far apart, when they ought to have been coming close together. When the Church remembers her responsibility for the terrible treatment of the Jews in the past, and contemplates the more terrible sufferings which they are bearing in the present, she must be eager to draw as near as possible to them. And Christians certainly have much to learn from the Jews. In a sense, as a recent writer has said, "the fate of Christianity depends on how much or how little Judaism it contains."[2] At present the form of

[1] Quoted by J. Maritain, *Antisemitism* (1939), p. 28.
[2] I. Maybaum, *Synagogue and Society* (1944), p. 49.

Christianity that is most popular in Britain contains dangerously little Judaism.

Yet when Christians and Jews enter into an understanding and faithful dialogue, we believe they find that the differences between them are more fundamental and inevitable than Dr Parkes supposes. Here we agree with Fr Gillet. It does make all the difference in the world whether you believe that Jesus is the Messiah who has come and will come again, or whether you deny that and believe that the Messiah has not yet come. Whoever holds either of these convictions is bound to have a sense of mission towards those who reject it, though whether or in what circumstances there should be organized "missions" is a further question. Our experience of these is too slight to warrant us in forming an opinion concerning them, but we have not found that a sense of mission on both sides bars the way to friendly and fruitful dialogues between Christians and Jews, in which each sincerely respect the other's convictions.

It may be that before long Christians and Jews, like the separated Christians, will be brought together in ways that cannot yet be clearly foreseen. As M. Maritain has said: "Malheur au Juif qui plaît comme au chrétien qui plaît. Et le temps vient peut-être, il est déjà venu dans certaines nations, où le témoignage de l'un et le témoignage de l'autre étant pareillement tenus pour intolérables, ils seront haïs et persécutés ensemble; et unis dans la persécution, ramenés ensemble à leurs sources."[1]

A Christian looks at the Christian Mission to the Jews[2]

I. The development of the "ecumenical movement" among the Christian Churches has posed anew the problem of the right attitude of any group convinced that it possesses the truth to those who do not share its view. Up to a couple of generations ago it would not have occurred to any loyal Protestant that his attitude to a Roman or Orthodox Christian should be other than the desire to convert him to Protestantism. There existed organized missions from one group of Christians to another. To-day the Romans are almost the only body who cannot conceive of any solution for non-Romans other than that of conversion to Romanism.

The "goodwill" movement between Christians and Jews is another product of this changed attitude among Christians. But, naturally perhaps, it has not been willing to go as far as the ecumenical movement has done. It evades the question of its compatibility with official missions to the Jews. There are Christians in the movement who condemn the missions, but they tend to be so liberal in their interpretation of Christianity that they have really deserted its basic ethos and are little more than vague theists or even pantheists. More orthodox Christians have merely shifted their ground a little and altered

[1] *Questions de conscience* (1938), pp. 78 f.
[2] This article is appearing in Hebrew in the *Metsudah*.

the nature of their protective colouring. They will no longer say outright: "Except a man believe that Jesus Christ is Son of God he cannot be saved"; they will say instead: "Is it not natural that if I have found a precious thing I should wish to share it?" On the Jewish side, in place of the fierce opposition of the past, there tends to be a well-mannered "Of course we know that Christianity is a missionary religion, but we won't talk about that *here*." Both sides then heave a sigh of relief at getting round an awkward corner, and say: "But we *can* co-operate in the social field and in fighting antisemitism."

But it's not very satisfying. It's a little too like the co-operation of politicians, with reserve on both sides. The position would be much happier were it recognized that the full "ecumenical" attitude was also right between Christians and Jews, as it is developing between the Christian Churches; but, as in the latter case, it would have to be without any sacrifice of loyalty or truth on either side. Looking at it from the Christian side, I am a sufficiently orthodox Christian to believe that in Jesus of Nazareth God was incarnate, completing thereby one period of His divine activity with men and initiating a second period of still fuller activity. I accept Jesus as Messiah, and I could not conceive of a relationship with Judaism which involved my denying this or regarding it as unessential. But the issue is not only "Was Jesus the Messiah?" There is a second question: Do the Christian Churches, and does the existing Christian tradition, so embody the totality of the truth implicit in the belief that, in Jesus, God was incarnate that I cannot recognize the equality of Judaism? If the answer to that question is "yes," as most Christians assume, and the Roman Church makes a fundamental article of belief, then indeed the only sincere approach to Jews is that of the missionaries. But I believe that both historical and theological evidence shows the answer to be "No." The existing Christian tradition does *not* embody the whole truth, and the Roman position, and the position of other churches when they make similar claims, is neither theologically nor historically tenable.

The door is therefore still open for Christians to recognize that Judaism also possesses, in its tradition, such truth that it is possible for Christians and Jews to regard each other in the same way as to-day Anglicans, for example, are regarding Presbyterians or Lutherans.

Only the irreligious will regard such an examination of another religion as arrogant or impertinent. Religious Jews as well as Christians accept the truth of the saying of Jesus: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell." The Jewish phrase that the righteous of all nations will inherit the world to come shows tolerance but not indifference. It made a wide definition of the word "righteous"; it did not say that righteousness did not matter.

II. I have said that the Christian tradition does not—or does not yet—embody the whole truth implicit in the Christian belief in the Incarnation. Here, however, I am only concerned with the implications of this statement as they affect Christian conceptions of, and relations with, Judaism.

Up to quite modern times the Church has always assumed that the

separation of the two religions took place in the days of the apostles and at the direct command of Jesus. The Jews were given their chance to accept Jesus as Messiah, rejected it, and that was the end of Judaism as a living religion, inheritor of divine promises. Henceforth Jews were preserved as evidence of the truth—of Christianity.

This is both theologically and historically untrue. Historically the separation took place at least fifty years after the death of Jesus; it took place partly because of human failings on both sides, partly because Christological doctrine at the time definitely impaired the unity of God; and partly because the Gentile Christian's conception of the nature of Judaism was totally erroneous.

That, however, is only the beginning of the story. It is in the conception which it has maintained throughout its life of the relation of Jesus to Judaism that the Christian tradition most manifestly has expressed only a portion of the truth. It has required the work of modern scholars such as Travers Herford and George Foote Moore to show that the picture of the Pharisees in the New Testament and the estimates of rabbinic Judaism in the church fathers are totally inadequate and often wholly mistaken; and this discovery has led in turn to the realization that the relation of Jesus with the Judaism of His day was much more intimate, and His dependence on it much closer, than the historic tradition assumes. The religion of Jesus was Judaism; His teaching was given with Judaism as its assumed background and framework. And Judaism went on living and developing after the second generation of His followers cut themselves off from it.

Judaism went on living; it continued to represent aspects of truth which the Christians had missed. Christianity also went on living and developing. It also, I believe, represented aspects of truth which were peculiar to it. I see no reason to belittle the record of either, or to deny the validity of the truths which each expresses. But if Christianity has completely misrepresented Judaism and the relation of its own founder to it, and if, at the vital moment of schism, its doctrine of the person of Jesus was such that it was not possible for Jews to accept it, these facts in themselves are sufficient to challenge the validity of the missionary approach as the official attitude of the Church to the Synagogue.

III. I find confirmation of this view in the history of the missionary effort itself. If, from the standpoint of God, Christianity were wholly right and Judaism wholly wrong, I would expect the consequences of the continuous missionary effort of the Church to be revealed in the richest spiritual harvest for Christianity and the profoundest spiritual influence on Jewry and Judaism. Instead we find the opposite. The record is a disastrous one and quite unlike the record of the consequences of missionary activity among adherents of any other religion. The mission to the Jews is the oldest of all the Christian missions. It has a continuous record of over 1,800 years; and, since during the greater part of that time the majority of the Jews have lived in scattered minorities within Christendom, Christians have had quite unusual opportunities of revealing themselves and their beliefs to their Jewish neighbours.

Of course there have been sincere and worthy converts from the Synagogue during this period. In many cases they are not the product of the missions. It is the consequences of the official attitude of the Churches which have been disastrous. It was because of her conception of the nature of Judaism that every injury inflicted on Jews was justified by Councils, by the ecclesiastical authorities, and by the theologians. The deprival of citizenship, the social boycott, the economic restriction, the ghetto, the auto-dà-fé and the stake—all these were, in their origin, the direct consequences of a theological belief.

That is half of the picture. The other half is equally terrible. Each of the three most dreadful accusations which have been levelled falsely against Jewry and Judaism originates with the statement of a "convert" which was accepted by contemporary Christians because he had embraced Christianity.

The accusation of ritual murder, with most elaborate details, was first made by Theobald, a monk of Cambridge, "who was once a Jew."[1] The accusation that the Jews had conspired with the lepers to poison the wells of Europe, and so caused the Black Death, was made at Parthenay in Anjou in 1321 by a converted Jew who had become a priest.[2] References to the demand made by Jews for protection from the activities of converts are to be found all through the Middle Ages. In modern times a converted "rabbi" explained that orthodox Jews needed a drop of Christian blood daily.[3] The activities of the converted Jew Brafman in Tsarist Russia, and his accusation that there was a secret world Jewish government pledged to the destruction of Christians, are too well known to need repeating. It was with Brafman that the idea of the Protocols originated. The converted Jew Paulus Meyer and the rôle he played in the antisemitic agitation in Vienna at the time of the Bloch-Deckert lawsuit are equally familiar.[4]

What is there on the other side? What record is there of Jewish converts standing up for their persecuted brethren or uniting to denounce these false accusations? We have to come to modern times to find any, and then there are few. There is Professor Chwolson in Russia, and there is the group of converts who signed the declaration that Jews have never used Christian blood in their ceremonies, which is embodied in the pamphlet dedicated by the Rev. Alexander McCaul to Queen Victoria at the time of the Damascus ritual murder agitation.[5] I find it difficult to believe that such a record is compatible with a belief that the missionary approach to Jewry is "well pleasing to God." And even if it be considered purely as a human enterprise, the evidence that there is something wrong about it and the views on which it is founded is surely overwhelming.

IV. This, then, is the first point. I do not approach Judaism on the basis of representing the whole of the truth myself, a claim which,

[1] Life of St William of Norwich by Thomas of Monmouth, II, xi.

[2] Quoted in letter of John XX, Mansi, XXV, c. 569.

[3] See Gougenot des Mousseaux, *Les Juifs, le Judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*, ch. vii, *passim*.

[4] Joseph Bloch, *My Reminiscences*, vol. II, *passim*.

[5] *Reasons for believing that the charge lately revived against the Jewish people is a baseless falsehood*, London, 1841.

however politely stated, inevitably implies an approach from a greater to a lesser enlightenment. But I am not going to the opposite extreme, of saying that all religions are equally good or equally true. The relationship between Christianity and Judaism is unique in many senses. Jesus was born a Jew; almost all the sacred scriptures of the Christian Church were composed by Jews; the Old Testament is equally accepted by Judaism and Christianity; and the Christian Church was founded by Jews. But that is not all; that is only the historical and the less important side. For theologically the relationship is also unique because Judaism was the religion of Jesus. The present position is that the Christian Church has the person of Jesus, but only scraps of His religion. The Synagogue has the religion of Jesus, but only scraps of His person. It seems to me futile for either side to adopt the official attitude that it must "convert" the other.

I would make a digression here. I am dealing with an official attitude. An individual of either faith has the right to communicate it to an individual of the other. There are some born Jews whose spiritual pilgrimage would be richer and more fruitful had they been born Christians; and there are some born Christians who would have been happier and more creative had they been born in Judaism. That there is no such mutual traffic between us is largely due to historic reasons and to the mistaken ideas each of us is apt to have about the other.

V. It is usually assumed by Jews that the effective barrier between the two religions is the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation of God in a human life; to be precise, in the human life of Jesus of Nazareth. Many Jews have come to see in Jesus a great Jewish prophet. The old picture of the *Sepher Toldoth Jeshu* may linger in some quarters, but it has been essentially abandoned. Jews to-day do not so much attack Jesus as what Christians—and particularly Paul—have made of Jesus.

Now I believe that the Christians are right in believing that in Jesus God was incarnate, and I believe that Jews are wrong in finding the idea of incarnation intolerable to Judaism. I think it is there as fully as in Christianity. In a recent book, *Communion in the Messiah*, a Christian missionary of the "new school" argues that the Jews have it in the conception of the Shekinah or the Memra, but in an incomplete form. In fact he wholly omits the place where the Jews have it in a complete form—that is, in the rabbinical doctrine of Torah. The incarnation of the infinite and eternal God in the finite life of Jesus, fixed in space and time, is doctrinally identical with the infinite and eternal God incarnate in Torah, limited in space and time. Both alike, in spite of the limitation, actually and satisfactorily express the Infinite and the Eternal, because they are focusing points of perpetual understanding and interpretation, whereby the infinite and eternal Godhead retains a living contact with each successive generation and its needs.

On the other hand it is usually assumed by Christians that "the Law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ," that "the Law" is a synonym for "Torah," and that it is now "superseded" by the fuller and more spiritual way of life "in Jesus." Already in the second century Justin tells us that most Christians held that it was impossible

to be a Christian and observe the Mosaic Law, and the amount of ridicule and denunciation Christians, from the earliest polemists to their latest successors, have aimed at the Law fills whole libraries.

I believe the Christians in this are wholly wrong. The Law=Torah =the religion of Jesus=the true way of life God has revealed to man. To ask Jews to leave Torah, to abandon its Way, is as wrong as to ask a Christian to abandon Christ.

The Church is as wrong in believing that Christianity includes all that is of value in the Old Testament as the Synagogue is wrong in believing that it excludes all that is implied to a Christian in the idea of the Incarnation of God in space and time. And the result of this dual error is, in fact, whatever it may be in intention, that the Church in asking a Jew to accept its interpretation of the person of Jesus is understood by both sides to be asking him to make an absolute break. But a break between the person and the religion of Jesus is absurd, and it is largely because of this divorce within the Church—between the person of Jesus and His religion—quite apart from the question of missions to the Jews—that the civilization which she has erected has now so catastrophically collapsed.

VI. As a result of the differences in their two central points—the Incarnation of God in Christ in one, and the Incarnation of God in Torah in the other—Judaism and Christianity have developed not only into two different religions but into two different kinds of religion. Because of its doctrine of Incarnation in a Person, the personal, and, in consequence, the "salvational," element in Christianity has always been dominant. Because of its conception of the Incarnation of God in Torah, Judaism has become a religion of a way of life. The active, communal and "this-worldly" elements have predominated. Of course in the best examples of both religions both elements will be found. But it is interesting to note the complete difference of the products at the other extreme. In one case neurotic revivalism and the hypocrisies of emotional belief; and in the other intellectual Pil-pul and the hypocrisies of formal conduct.

Looking out towards the future, and looking at the crying needs of the world, it seems to me that in the time to come men will need, and God will use, the truths of both religions. In what form I do not know. I really mean *I do not know*; I cannot see how present Christianity is to draw near to present Judaism or *vice versa* in any organizational or doctrinal form which would not involve the surrender of that which, at the present time, is the value to God of each. At present each side seems to be convinced that it has got the truth, and does not need the other. I am convinced that both have got the truth, and each needs the other.

My concern, however, is with the immediate future, with the next step. There are, on both sides, immense factual, and still more immense psychological, difficulties to be surmounted in the approach to the other. In both cases our existing traditions themselves need considerable re-examination in the light of the new tasks to which God is calling them. I think we shall have achieved all that is possible for this generation if we reach the stage where we are anxious better to

understand each other; if we overcome the psychological barriers to an open approach to each other; and if we reach the position where we can admire and fraternize with each other without its causing heartburnings and anger among our own leaders. The next step after that we can leave to God. He may need both of us; He may need neither of us; He may have plans for us which to-day would seem totally incapable of realization.

JAMES PARKES.

BARLEY.

Some Remarks on Dr Parkes' Article

I. WE agree with Dr Parkes that a mere "goodwill" movement between Christians and Jews, evading the doctrinal issues, cannot fully satisfy either of them. We further agree that the missions to the Jews suffer from many shortcomings. That these missions themselves are aware of the need for improvement in knowledge, practical methods and inner feelings will be quite clear to anybody who reads the proceedings of the missionary conferences of Budapest and Warsaw (1927) and Atlantic City (1931). But the main contentions of Dr Parkes are unacceptable to any Christian taking his stand on the basis of the New Testament. As Dr Parkes' article is also appearing in a Jewish periodical, it is only fair to the Jews to say this without ambiguity.

II. We think that Dr Parkes' references to the "ecumenical movement" are fallacious. One cannot draw a parallel between the interrelationship of Christian Churches and the relationship between Christians and non-Christians. The Lambeth Appeal of 1920 says: "We acknowledge all those who believe in Our Lord Jesus and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity." It is *not* possible for Christians and Jews "to regard each other in the same way as to-day Anglicans, for example, are regarding Presbyterians or Lutherans." Moreover, within the ecumenical movement itself, a Greek Orthodox, an Anglo-Catholic, a Barthian Calvinist and a strict Lutheran—letting alone Roman Catholics—do not consider each other as possessing the same measure of light. We do not say that this position is right or wrong; we simply state it as an existing fact.

III. Dr Parkes, explaining the separation of Judaism and Christianity "at least fifty years after the death of Jesus," attributes it partly to human failings on both sides and partly to the Gentile misunderstanding of Judaism. We agree. But Dr Parkes indicates another cause: " . . . because Christological doctrine at the time definitely impaired the unity of God." Dr Parkes does not say what he considers as the authentic expression of Christological doctrine about the year 50. But his text implies that the beliefs of the apostolic generation and the preaching of Paul were impairing the unity of God—"definitely" impairing it. Any non-Modernist Christian (we do not speak of Unitarians) will vehemently repudiate this assertion. Martin Buber has exactly expressed that which separated most deeply Judaism and Christianity in 50 as it separates them in 1944: "He who acknow-

ledges Jesus to be the Messiah already come cannot belong to us; he who tries to weaken or divert our belief in a redemption still to come, there is no agreement with him."[1]

IV. Dr Parkes is singularly tendencious and unfair in his treatment of the converts from Judaism. He selects a few cases in which dreadful accusations have been levelled falsely by converts against the Jews. We must observe that each of these cases would call for some critical remarks.[2] Then Dr Parkes goes on: "What record is there of Jewish converts standing up for their persecuted brethren or uniting to denounce their false accusations? We have to come to modern times to find any." This is perfectly untrue. As early as 1235, after the blood accusation of Fulda, the German emperor Frederic II invited a large number of distinguished Jewish converts from all parts of Europe and consulted them about ritual murder. They gave a detailed answer, denying the existence of such, and the emperor, on the strength of this answer, pronounced a judgment exonerating the Jews from all suspicion. In modern times, Dr Parkes finds only two instances of converts taking the defence of the Jews: Professor Chwolson in Russia and the group who signed a declaration at the time of the Damascus affair. He could have indicated that this last protest, embodied in M'Caul's pamphlet (the date of which is 1840, and not 1841, as Dr Parkes asserts), was signed by fifty-eight converts. He could have added to their names the famous Austrian Catholic preacher Johann Veith, also a convert. Dr Parkes finds that the record of the missions to the Jews "is a disastrous one." Our only reply will be to recall the names of some converts: Caspari, Edersheim, F. C. Ewald, Neander, J. Wolff, Salkinson, Ginsburg, da Costa, Capadose, Ragnild Haerm, Lindstrom, Bernoulli, Saphir, Ratisbonne, Libermann, Wilkinson, Baron. For such men the Christians may well thank God.

[1] Quoted by H. Kosmala in *International Review of Missions*, vol. xxvi, 1937, p. 110.

[2] The case of William of Norwich and of the convert Theobald is not so clear as is often said. See the critical edition of the *Life of St William*, by Thomas of Monmouth, edited by A. Jessopp and M. James, Cambridge, 1896, especially pp. lxxii, lxxiii, lxxix. Dr Parkes quotes a letter of John XX, in order to confirm his assertion that the accusation of the poisoning of wells by Jews was made by a converted Jew who had become a priest. A letter of Charles, Count of Anjou, reproduced by John XX in his own letter (Mansi, XXV, col. 569-572), says that seven Jews, of whom two were baptized, confessed to the poisoning of wells, *non tamen voluntarie, sed vi et metu, positi in quæstionibus et tormentis*. Nothing is said about one of these Jews having become a priest. Before the affair of 1321, the theory of the poisoning of the wells had been started in 1319 in Franconia (Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniæ*, XII, 416). Dr Parkes says that a converted rabbi explained, in modern times, that orthodox Jews needed daily a drop of Christian blood. We regret that Dr Parkes gives no details about that rabbi, not even his name, but simply refers to a French book by Gougenot des Mousseaux (without mentioning the date and place of publication). This book, published in Paris (1869), has become unluckily unavailable in the British Museum. The title given by Dr Parkes does not exactly reproduce the title as it is found in the catalogue of the Museum. Dr Parkes says that the idea of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion originated with the converted Jew Brafman. There is not the slightest evidence that the *Kinha Kahala* (Vilna, 1869) of Joseph Brafmann (not Brafman) has influenced the Protocols. The *Dialogue* of Joly (Brussels, 1865) is recognized as their basis. See *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion*, by J. Cutriss, Columbia University Press, 1942.

V. Dr Parkes writes: "Judaism was the religion of Jesus." And again: "Torah=the religion of Jesus." But there is far more in the teaching of Jesus than in the Torah and in Judaism. Jesus said: "*I* am the way." His message is centred around a person, not around ethics. We may, of course, discard the "salvational" element of the New Testament as a late construction. This will be an individual conception of Christianity, not the conception of the Christian Church. Even in the sphere of ethics Jesus transcends Judaism. Rabbi J. Klausner emphasizes[1] the fact that Jesus brought Judaism to such an extreme that it became non-Judaism, the negation of everything that had vitalized Judaism: He sacrificed the God of justice to the God of mercy, He sacrificed the God of order, of history and of the nation; therefore, says Klausner, the Jews cannot regard Him as a lawgiver or even a rabbi.

VI. Dr Parkes believes that "in Jesus of Nazareth God was incarnate." He later on develops a parallel—even more—between the Incarnation in Jesus and the Incarnation in the Torah:[2] "The incarnation of the infinite and eternal God in the finite life of Jesus . . . is doctrinally *identical*[3] with the infinite and eternal God incarnate in Torah." Every Christian (in the traditional sense) will find here an intolerable confusion. If the Incarnation of God in Jesus means that Jesus is the Word made flesh, the Son of the Father in a wholly unique sense, and that the fullness of the Godhead resides in Him, there is no identity between this coming of God into the flesh and a metaphorical "incarnation" in a law, however divinely given. The abyss between the Torah and Jesus Christ, true Man and true God, consubstantial with the Father, is precisely the abyss between Judaism and Christianity.

VII. Dr Parkes does not express his views about the Atonement, the Cross, the meaning of the death of Christ. This is certainly no part of the Torah. The scandal of the Cross, the taking away of our sins by the Lamb of God—this has separated and continues to separate Judaism and Christianity. We wonder why Dr Parkes, writing his article for a Jewish periodical, has not emphasized the place which Christ crucified and risen occupies in the faith of the Christian Church and indicated how such a faith is opposed to Judaism.[4]

VIII. It is now quite clear that we can but reject the phrase "equality

[1] *Jesus of Nazareth*, transl. by H. Danby, 1925.

[2] Speaking of our book *Communion in the Messiah*, Dr Parkes says that the author, whom he erroneously describes as a missionary, "wholly omits the place where the Jews have" the idea of the Incarnation "in a complete form, that is, in the rabbinical conception of the Torah." Now on p. 60 of that book we wrote that the Torah "was the revelation and coming down of God to man," and on p. 61: "One should rather, with Parkes, speak of the Torah as an 'Incarnation' of the Divine." (Does Dr Parkes often read his sources in that fashion?) But we entirely deny that the "Incarnation" of God in the Torah could be more than metaphorical.

[3] Italics ours.

[4] When we speak of Judaism, we mean Judaism as professed by the majority of Jews. We are well aware that a minority of mystics, meditating on the Memra, the Shekinah and atoning suffering, must be situated on a line which tends towards Christianity. Philo is not far from the New Testament. But such voices have become rare within Judaism.

of Judaism" used by Dr Parkes. Whatever may be our respect for Judaism and our sympathy for the Jews, it is impossible to admit that there are two equivalent ways, the way of the Torah and the way that is Christ, both divinely appointed for different needs and purposes. Christ transcends Hellenism and Judaism. His claims as Lord and Saviour extend to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles. The approach of Christianity to Judaism is what Dr Parkes calls "an approach from a greater to a lesser enlightenment." Dr Parkes wishes to avoid such an approach; he thinks it "futile for either side to adopt the official attitude that it must 'convert' the other." But the Apostles took such an attitude. The methods may change. They often ought to be changed, and we are by no means convinced that preaching or writing apologetical books is nowadays the best method for bringing the Gospel to the Jews.[1] Methods are relative, but the validity of the Christian mission to Israel remains unchanged. As H. Kraemer excellently says: "It is no mistaken form of proselytism, but it belongs to the very essence of obedience to God that a Christian and a missionary should live by the ardent desire that all men will surrender to Christ as the Lord of their lives. Whosoever does not stress that, does not sufficiently consider the passionately prophetic and apostolic spirit of the Gospel."[2]

Lev Gillet.

Christian Institute of Jewish Studies, London.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Church and the Papacy. By T. G. Jalland. (The Bampton Lectures for 1942.) S.P.C.K. 25s.

In the prayer which traditionally opens every day's session of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, the members declare their thankfulness *quia ad amussim sanctæ Reformationis nostræ errores, corruptelas, et superstitiones olim hic grassantes tyrannidemque papalem merito et serio repudiavimus*. The suffrage breathes the atmosphere of a bygone age of controversy; and Dr Jalland is justified in believing that sufficient water has since flowed under the bridges alike of Tiber and Thames to merit a further full-dress examination of papal claims, in the light both of modern historical scholarship and of contemporary aspirations towards the reunion of Christendom. In his Bampton Lectures for 1942 he has essayed a survey of the history and claims of the papacy from the first century to the nineteenth; and it may be said at once that his ambitious undertaking is justified by the volume now published. Naturally he has given more detailed and particular attention to the first six centuries, upon which his conclusions must stand or fall; and it has to be admitted that in consequence the sixth

[1] Praying together has become to-day a fruitful way of *rapprochement* between Christians of different denominations. Could not a Fellowship of Prayer be formed between Jews and Christians, neither of them abdicating their own beliefs?

[2] *The Christian Message in a non-Christian World*, London, 1938, p. 443.

and seventh chapters, in which he considers the medieval papacy from Gregory the Great to the Renaissance, and the modern papacy from the Reformation to Pius IX respectively, suffer so severely from the purely outline sketch which is all that the period of history covered and the space at his disposal permit, that their contribution to the development of his theme is inconsiderable. In the first five chapters the reader must expect to concentrate his full energies of mind to follow the closely-knit and very detailed narrative, formidably buttressed by footnotes. The theme calls for grave treatment; and the author makes no attempt (beyond incidental descriptions of the Vatican Council and of the flight of two of the inopportunist bishops from the final scene) to lighten the solidity of his book with anecdotal episodes. Throughout the reader is impressed by the industry, detail and scope of the investigation; and there can be no doubt that the volume will establish its place in the series of weighty and learned studies evoked by the foundation of Canon Bampton.

Dr Jalland avows his aspiration, not to contribute material "which may fairly be represented as a new or strictly-speaking original discovery," but rather that his book here and there "may contain an element of the unexpected." In several respects his essay to incorporate and interpret the results of recent historical investigation fulfils this aim. Thus by following Dr Lowther Clarke's essay on *The Origins of Episcopacy* and at the same time developing the theory of polyepiscopacy and emphasizing the liturgical functions of the early holders of this office, he endeavours to establish a new outpost "in the direction of vindicating episcopacy as an integral and primitive element in the organization" of the church at Rome. Similarly his interpretation of Irenæus' evidence which Eusebius cites in connexion with the Quartodeciman controversy, presents a convincing argument that the historian misunderstood his source and that Irenæus referred simply "to the attitude of the Roman church towards the practice of residents or visitors of provincial origin." Again, his marshalling of the evidence in favour of the priority of the Petrine version of Cyprian's *De Unitate Ecclesiæ* offers a persuasive and useful explanation of the complex of questions concerning Cyprian's attitude to the Roman see. Likewise Dr Jalland brings out with particular force and clarity the importance of the advance in prestige of Rome as a rallying-point for the forces of ecclesiastical authority against the dangers of Cæsaropapism in the Christian Roman empire; and thereby he provides a serviceable clue to the confused history of the conciliar period. From this point forward, moreover, evidence of the emphatic assertion and exercise of papal authority becomes more unequivocal.

In the New Testament period Dr Jalland may anticipate general agreement with his argument, following in the steps of the late Professor Turner, for the prominence of St Peter, both in the Gospels and in the *Acts of the Apostles*. But in order to present it as a sufficient basis for a Petrine primacy of authority, it seems at times that everything which tells in its favour is maximized, whilst all that tells against it is minimized. Thus (to quote but two examples) the order in which St Paul mentions the "pillars" of the church in *Galatians* is "dictated

by no more than a natural inclination to put in the first place the name of one [St James] who was in so unique a relation not only to the local church, but also to our Lord himself"; whilst the order chosen in 1 *Corinthians* "might suggest that St Paul regards him [St Peter] as possessing some priority" (p. 62). Again, St James' presidency at the apostolic council is explained by that of a modern democratic assembly, wherein, though he votes last indeed, "it is the summing up of a chairman not the verdict of an arbiter"; whereas the speech of St Peter is represented as the decisive factor. It might be allowed that there is something to be said for Dr Jalland's summary of the New Testament evidence as indicating that "a decision made by St Peter . . . was liable to be accepted as the norm" (p. 60); but it is surprising indeed to find this same evidence adduced to support the conclusion that St Peter in the apostolic church was the authority "from whose decision there would seem to lie no appeal" (p. 64). One would like to hear St Paul's opinion of this latter statement. It is, indeed, just to observe that in his final summary of conclusions Dr Jalland reverts to the more modest contention that the New Testament witness establishes "that St Peter received at our Lord's hands a certain preference" (p. 527).

Even so two wide gaps remain to be bridged: the one between the Dominical words to St Peter and the tradition that he was bishop of Rome; and the other between St Peter's position and the claim that his authority devolved solely upon later bishops at Rome. Dr Jalland admits "the absence of any indubitable evidence within the New Testament" for the connexion of St Peter with the church at Rome; and allows only one item of dubitable Scriptural evidence. The testimony of post-apostolic writers has been roughly handled by Professor Merrill, who (though he may fail to carry conviction in his main contention) has presented a forcible criticism of the quality and quantity of evidence for the ecclesiastical tradition associating St Peter with Rome. Dr Jalland mentions the (admittedly general and unprecise) reference to SS. Peter and Paul in 1 *Clement*, the somewhat similarly-general reference in Ignatius (both which he allows to fall "considerably short of positive demonstration"), the first precise reference by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, in the third quarter of the second century, and the later reference by Irenæus; but it is noteworthy that all these writers couple the names of both apostles; and it is therefore somewhat unexpectedly that the reader finds Dr Jalland selecting St Peter's association with Rome for especial prominence and emphasis when he writes of this evidence that "the tradition which associates the work and martyrdom of both apostles, and particularly of St Peter, with the capital is well founded" (p. 123). It would seem more appropriate if St Paul were here selected for this particular mention.

But, accepting the traditional association of St Peter with the church at Rome, is it necessary to ascribe the prominence of that church in the second century to the authority devolved by him upon its bishop? Dr Jalland criticizes strongly the attempt of Dr Kidd and other historians to introduce in this regard the importance of Rome as the

imperial capital. Yet there is surely a sufficient recognition of the influence of this factor in the words of Leo the Great, quoted by Dr Jalland, that when the apostles made a division of the world for their missionary labours "the most blessed Peter, chief of the apostolic band, was sent to the citadel of the Roman empire; that thus the light of Truth . . . might shine forth with greater efficacy throughout the whole world from the very capital itself" (p. 302).

It would be incorrect to ascribe the pre-eminence of the Roman church to the secular prestige of imperial Rome alone; but the attraction of Rome as the capital cannot be entirely ignored. Moreover Dr Jalland, arguing that "during the second century this primacy was accepted as a matter of practical convenience," adds that "as yet no one troubled to ask the reason" (p. 106). Then he proceeds forthwith to show that Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Irenæus all refer to the twin apostolic foundation of the church at Rome, which surely both asks and gives the reason. For it is not to be forgotten that Rome alone of western churches could claim historically apostolic foundation; and when appeal was made to apostolic tradition as preserved by churches of apostolic foundation, the primacy of Rome in the west, resting upon a tradition of twin apostolic labours, was literally without peer. Upon the process by which the appeal to the twin apostolic tradition became transformed into that to the *cathedra Petri* close scrutiny should be directed. In respect of the Roman claim to the succession of the Petrine primacy, Dr Jalland observes that if Antioch is the place of origin of *St Matthew*, being also a city where both apostles had worked, its preservation of the famous Petrine texts is significant. It may be argued *pari passu* that the absence of all record of them from *St Mark* is also significant in view of its traditional provenance from Rome; for is it not striking that Peter, teaching in Rome itself, should have made no mention of sufficient emphasis to stamp itself upon the record of *St Mark*, of the indissoluble connexion between his own pre-eminence and that of Rome in the Christian church? Likewise Dr Jalland explains the scantiness of the information presented by Eusebius concerning the see of Rome by the observation that since the historian's purpose was "to hand on in writing . . . a record of those who had presided with distinction over this society [the church] in the most outstanding local churches," it follows from this "that the recording of papal history formed . . . a part only of his immense pioneer undertaking." The phenomenon is patient also of the interpretation that Eusebius was unaware of such a papal primacy in the whole church as to require fuller narration. Dr Jalland indeed observes that "those who are seeking evidence for the exercise of an universal jurisdiction on the part of the papacy in this pre-Nicene period are after all on the trail of a chimera" (p. 182); and though his emphasis upon the primary function of the episcopate during the pre-Constantinian period, as being concerned with liturgy rather than with jurisdiction, goes a considerable way to explain this judgment, it is also true, as he remarks, that the ecumenical councils only adopted papal orthodoxy in the sphere of doctrine (as for example in the case of the Tome of Leo) after discussion and debate, and not upon

any notion of obligation by obedience to a superior authority to do so.

It is primarily upon the evidence of the pre-Nicene period that the claim for a Roman primacy *divino jure* must rest; and Dr Jalland seems to glide too lightly over the transition from the appeal to the twin apostolic foundation of the Roman church to the tradition of Rome as the *cathedra Petri*, and to make too easy an identification of the prominence of the church of Rome in the second and third centuries with the Petrine primacy supposed to have devolved on later bishops of Rome. But it is difficult to be sure that Dr Jalland is entirely self-consistent upon this matter of the relationship between the two apostles and between the see of Rome and both. Thus in his concluding summary he writes that "it would seem impossible to allow that so far as the evidence of the New Testament carries us, St Peter was usually acknowledged by his contemporaries as possessed of more than a priority of judgment, to which they did in fact normally refer" (p. 527) This differs considerably from his earlier interpretation of the New Testament as exalting St Peter to the position of a leader "from whose decision there would seem to lie no appeal" (p. 64).

On page 528 he observes that the authority of the Roman see during the first three centuries "was due to the connection of that see with St Peter as one of its co-founders"; and in the next paragraph, and on the same page, that "it must be allowed that the *episcopi* of the primitive Roman Christian community succeeded to St Peter's position in Rome, as the *episcopi* of the Corinthian community succeeded St Paul at Corinth."

The reader might be puzzled to know why the Roman *episcopi* did not succeed to St Paul's position in their own church, like their Corinthian counterparts, and why no mention should be made in tracing their ancestry and authority of St Paul; but in fact in the following argument on page 542 Dr. Jalland supplies the answer by agreeing that "the Roman *episcopi* . . . were held to be and were in fact the heirs of the authority of St Peter and of his co-apostle St Paul in the Roman see."

To the present reader it would appear that the evidence in support of the Roman claim that the primacy of Rome in the church is *divino jure* and of Dominical appointment is patient of a verdict only of "not proven." It seems probable that Dr Jalland would concur in this opinion. It would be admitted by most ecclesiastical historians that during some periods of its history the Roman see and its occupants may be truly believed to have developed and functioned *divina providentia* for the protection and preservation of vital elements both of faith and practice in the Christian tradition, as Dr Jalland sufficiently illustrates from the Christian Roman Empire and the early Middle Ages. Equal candour, however, would compel the parallel admission that during other periods the papacy has been a scandal and chief cause of offence; and Dr Jalland's sharp censures upon the papacy of the later Middle Ages, of the early sixteenth and of the eighteenth centuries, indicate his concurrence. If the appeal is to history, therefore, the papacy can expect only a mixture of praise and blame.

Moreover the most recent definition of papal claims in the spheres alike of doctrine and of jurisdiction, by the decree of the Vatican Council of 1870, has, as Dr Jalland fully admits, created additional difficulties to their acceptance. It is not necessary to enter into his detailed commentary upon and criticism of the constitution *Pastor Aeternus*; though it may perhaps be useful to observe that the last-minute addition to the Infallibility definition of a phrase declaring the papal pronouncements in accordance with its provisions to be irreformable by virtue of the papal promulgation and not by consequence of the assent of the church, has added a further obstacle to a decree already sufficiently furnished with difficulties. Dr Jalland devotes considerable attention to the question of how far Anglicans may go in acceptance of its contents. In this respect it may appear that one consideration has eluded his notice. For Christians of the papal obedience acceptance of the Vatican decree is *de fide*; whereas the VIth Article of the Anglican XXXIX Articles of Religion affirms that "whatsoever is not read therein [in Holy Scripture] nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith." Scripture and ecclesiastical history do not forbid recognition of a primacy of honour of the church of Rome by virtue of its association with the apostolate of St Paul and of St Peter. If its claims are to be grounded upon the Petrine texts, the exclusive relationship of those texts to Rome, and the exclusive inheritance of the authority promised therein by the bishops of Rome, it must content those who are sons in the faith no less of St Paul than of St Peter to dissent from any such pretensions to a primacy of jurisdiction and of doctrinal infallibility *divino jure*; and, so far as negotiations for reunion are initiated upon the basis of historical development, to affirm with Laud that the fulfilment of their aim is unlikely to be realized until Rome be other than she now is.

Norman Sykes.
Oxford.

The Form of the Church. By A. G. Hebert. Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.

Fr Hebert has in this book investigated the nature of the Church along lines which have seldom been followed by English theologians and have probably never been followed in so thorough and systematic a way. The nearest approach to Fr Hebert's treatment was made by R. C. Moberly forty-seven years ago in the first two chapters of *Ministerial Priesthood*, entitled "The Nature of Christian Unity" and "The Relation between Inward and Outward." But whereas Moberly went no farther than a demonstration of the necessity of "form" for the existence of the Church, Fr Hebert has discussed what are the essential forms of the Church as contrasted with those which are secondary and variable. Writing partly with the argument of *The Nature of Catholicity* by D. T. Jenkins in mind, he combines an uncompromisingly Catholic exposition of the Church with an insistence upon the positive value of the Reformed tradition.

The book begins with a discussion of the idea of "form" and the use

of such words as "formative" and "formal." "Form" is essential to the existence of life, but "form" of itself is dead. As regards the Church it is wrong to contrast "form" with "life" but right to insist that the forms serve their true end only through the action of the Holy Spirit upon them. The essential forms of the Church, whereby God's redemption is mediated to us, are Baptism, the Eucharist, the Creed as the summary of the Gospel message, the Holy Scriptures, and the Apostolic ministry. But these forms "of themselves profit nothing: they need the Holy Ghost to draw out the meaning that is in them, and to make them living to us." These forms are essential, because God created them to serve His purpose of the redemption of mankind into His universal Church. But the divine and uncreated Form of the Church is our Lord Himself, the Form whom the Spirit reproduces in the souls of men.

Such is the theme of the first four chapters. There follow four chapters upon the notes of the Church—unity, holiness, catholicity, apostolicity. Here the treatment is along more familiar lines; but it is distinguished by the use of the conception worked out in the earlier chapters, by some searching comments upon contemporary problems, and by a freshness in the treatment of some of the criticisms made by theologians of the Reformed tradition. It is in connexion with this last point that the most arresting passages of the book are written.

The *unity* of the Church is not a mere attribute of the Church; it is the unity of Christ Himself, a unity into which men are drawn. Similarly Christ Himself is the substance of the *holiness* of the Church, the Word and the Sacraments being the forms whereby He consecrates His people in union with His own redemptive acts in history. These forms are essential, but they "cannot be mechanized . . . grace is another name for the operation and gift of the Holy Ghost; and He always retains His initiative. . . . It is He alone who sanctifies and consecrates." It is in this connexion that the vocation of Protestantism appears, for the real truth of Protestantism lies not merely in its protest against abuses, nor in the misleading antithesis which it sometimes makes between spirit and form so as to belittle the latter unwarrantably, but in its zeal to assert the reality of God and the sovereign power of His Spirit as against tendencies to forget Him and to "manipulate" the means of grace for human ends. There is a similar insistence upon this tension in Fr Hebert's treatment of *catholicity*. "Of the Jerusalem which is above the Church on earth is the representative, the sacramental embodiment; it exists for the sake of the Reign of God, that by its means His royal authority may be acknowledged and made effectual. But it can never be identified with that reign. . . . The Catholicity of the Church rests not on a truth of man, but on the Truth of God in Christ, to which man is set to bear witness." Fr Hebert goes on to mention the opportunity that is given to the Church of England to express a catholicity which holds to the truth of God and the essential forms of the Church and yet avoids confusing the forms with the truth that gives them their meaning.

As regards *apostolicity*, Fr Hebert comes closely to grips with the issues that divide Catholic and Reformed. "Without the Holy Spirit

the Apostle can do nothing. . . . So with the Ministry; if God takes away the Holy Spirit from us, there can be nothing left but human presumption. That is a truth that we are so continually forgetting, that we must pray our Protestant friends to remind us of it." None the less the "form" of the ministry is essential, because the apostles are constituted as apostles not by the fact that they give testimony but by their receiving of a commission from Christ. What is essential is not the episcopate as such, nor the threefold ministry as such, but a ministry that holds the commission handed down from Christ and the apostles, the "Essential Ministry" in contrast with the "Dependent Ministry," which hangs upon it. To-day the ministries of the Free Churches are something different and mean something different, and to say that they are the same is to blur the distinctive truth for which they have stood.

In conclusion, what shall we say? *The Form of the Church* is both a book for the times and a piece of solid theological writing, the most solid that has yet come from its author's pen. The book perhaps falls short of *conclusiveness* in its treatment of the emergence of the "forms" of the Church in history. As regards Baptism and the Eucharist as "essential" forms, the writer is on impregnable ground. As regards the apostolic ministry, by emphasizing the transmitted commission as essential rather than the episcopate as such he can be very sure of his ground. But as regards the Creeds, it would be possible for someone to argue that the "essential" form was a confession of faith that Jesus is Lord and that the variety of baptismal and conciliar creeds were secondary forms. The test of Fr Hebert's thesis will be the ability or inability of scholars of other traditions to get different results from his own principle. His book does not demonstrate that they are bound to fail, but it makes it appear unlikely that they will succeed.

DURHAM. A. M. RAMSEY.

THE NINE BRIGHT SHINERS. By Anne Ridler. Faber. 6s.
FIVE RIVERS. By Norman Nicholson. Faber. 6s.

In the last twelve months half-a-dozen volumes of poetry have appeared which stand in some relation to one another. Their authors cannot be said to form a coherent group. They have not appeared together in any anthology or periodical, and yet it is impossible not to notice a connexion between the two books reviewed here and Miss Kathleen Raine's *Stone and Flower*, the poems of Mr David Gascoyne, the elegies of Mr Alex Comfort, and *The Cruel Solstice* of Sidney Keyes, killed in Tunisia. Their level of accomplishment varies. Miss Raine's workmanship is more consistently mature than Mr Nicholson's or Mrs Ridler's, but the two books chosen for review are likely to be of the most immediate interest to readers of THEOLOGY.

If the other books were unsympathetic to our concerns, and to our approach to those concerns, it would be more important that we should read them, but they are not. Only their concern for theological problems is more tightly wrapped in the language of their own particular experiences. Mrs Ridler builds a bridge, on the one hand to the

liturgy, and on the other to the common speech of lonely wives and mothers, parted by war from their husbands and watching in their children the effective symbols of the new life. From time to time her plain unvarnished statement may tremble on the edge of the prosaic:

> Here and there snarled or gaudy, but still strong-fibred,
> With common words in a strange dye, with knots of metaphysic—
> This is the mesh that drew the loud myth so close.

It is a mistake to overstress the domestic subject-matter, as some reviewers have done. No image could be more truly "metaphysical" than

> And then, what possible relation
> Exists between the darling of one moment
> And the crimson barbarous brat of another instant?

or

> Here the extraordinary fact of Being, which we see
> Stripped and simple as the speechless stranger on my knee.

Mr Nicholson's poetry is boisterous and occasionally careless, but always full of rhythmical vitality. His regional label may be misleading until we discover from his address to his river Duddon the difference between his Cumberland and Wordsworth's. His is the Whitehaven-Workington industrial area, with the sea on one side and the mountains on the other, a symbol of industrial England in her older surroundings. Every detail of the picture is lovingly described, the rocks and animals, birds, flowers, and weeds of "thirty thousand feet of solid Cumberland." And yet at any moment it is "ready to vanish away,"

> When Gabriel, the brigand, guides
> His fiery frigate through the clouds

and

> Blows the Horn of Egremont.

At any time Noah's flood may come again, when the earth changes her moon, which

> bursts as if charged with dynamite, is whirled
> In closing spirals, and the fragments hurled
> Down to the dark equator of the world.

It is this sense of the nearness of death that gives such poignancy to this poetry, but a poignancy altogether free from any note of depression:

> For as Christ's death
> Gave life to the living, and made the young dead turn
> Like a waking child, so this and every birth
> Repudiates all dying on the earth.

There is no death where the judgment leads to the restoration and reconciliation of everything in nature,

> The stickleback shall swim between the heron's feet.

The organization of this poetry is not perfect, but it always combines anticipation with a fresh surprise.

George Every, S.S.M.
Kelham.

SHORTER NOTICES

Prophets for a Day of Judgment. By A. E. Baker. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 4s. 6d.

The Archbishop of Canterbury's Lent Book for 1944 gives studies of Jeremiah, Augustine of Hippo, Julian of Norwich, and Dostoevsky. The connexion between them all and ourselves is that they and we face a time of historical crisis. With wise restraint, Canon Baker allows each figure to speak for himself, not attempting to overlabour the history-repeats-itself *motif* in a manner which is becoming trite and irritating. All the same we could have wished that he had in his final chapter picked up the threads of his four studies, instead of appearing himself in the last scene as a "prophet for a day of judgment." For, although the mantle becomes him well, we are left with a disconnected impression of the book as a whole. But doubtless the author meant us to think for ourselves!

The Seven Steps of the Ladder of Spiritual Love. By Van Ruysbroeck. Dacre Press. 3s. 6d.

Exquisitely translated from the Flemish by F. Sherwood Taylor and judiciously introduced by Fr Joseph Bolland, S.J., who warns beginners not to imagine, like unprofessional medical students, that they are themselves suffering from all the symptoms described! *The Seven Steps* is a piece of genuinely Christian mysticism, and readers of Nygren will find that the love spoken of here is not ἔρως but ἀγάπη coming forth from God in Christ and returning to Him in grateful response.

R. H. Fuller.

Ashbourne.

Socratic Digest. June, 1944. Obtainable from Miss Aldwinckle, 42, Leckford Road, Oxford. 1s. 2d., post free.

This contains a précis of some of the papers that were read to the Oxford University Socratic Club during the academic year 1943-4. Two are printed in full—Mr. C. S. Lewis on "Bulverism, or The Foundation of 20th Century Thought," and Professor H. A. Hodges on "Philosophy To-day." The latter is a notable review of the history of philosophy and an estimate of its present condition.

A. R. V.

God's Innocence. By Baron Erik Palmstierna. Andrew Dakers. 2s. 6d.

This book is written by a Swedish diplomat who knows that something more than politics is needed to put the world right. He commends a theology which thinks of God as ignorant of all evil; He does not destroy evil or overcome it—He does not even know that it exists! The Baron has read widely, but he should not rashly claim to stand in the Christian tradition.

A. C. S.

CORRESPONDENCE

"NO OTHER GOSPEL"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I am delighted to learn from Principal Cobham's letter in your August number that I was not justified in considering him in general as "profoundly worried by the negative condemnations which accompany" the testimonies of the Confessional Church. But his very letter to you confirms that he *is* worried, about one of the condemnations—namely, just that which, in present-day theology, is the main point at issue. That is "a 'No' that in condemning the 'German Christians' appeared to impinge on the Christian Doctrine of Creation." Is it not rather an old legend that we condemn the Doctrine of the Church on Creation? Yes, we certainly do so, when the Christian (revealed) Doctrine of Creation and a non-Christian (natural) doctrine of it are more or less identified. But we certainly do not do so, nay, we vigorously proclaim the Christian Faith in the revealed fact of Creation when we are allowed to omit any amalgamations with "natural facts"; *vide* Luther's faith in the Gracious God in Creation, stated in the first section of the Creed in his Minor Catechism. Only he, therefore, who mixes revealed and non-revealed theology of Creation is, by the Confessional Church, condemned as co-guilty of the notorious heresy of the Nazi-Christians. But the real Christian Doctrine of Creation (according to Gen., John i, Ps. civ, Col. i, 16, etc.)—Bishop Butler's theology is still nearer to it than it is to what Principal Cobham himself seems to understand to be "the line of traditional theology" about Creation in the Church of England—is even a mighty and most profitable pillar in the confessional battle of the Church for "No Other Gospel."

Now Principal Cobham, the strong fighter against "the other gospels," may kindly reconsider whether he can join the confessionals in the battle, without any hesitations or not.

Yours very truly,

H. P. EHRENBERG.

As from GERMAN CONFESSIONAL INSTITUTE,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1.
August 13, 1944.

"OUR STRUGGLE"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

This letter will, I hope, be regarded, not so much as a counter-comment to your own, Dr Oldham's and Mr Thompson's comments on my article, as an attempt to make myself clear on certain matters about which, after reading what you have written, I feel that I have laid myself open to misunderstanding.

The parish priest to-day is so continually made aware of the problems, opportunities and sometimes hardships which his faithful people meet in the workaday world that I confess that it had not occurred to me

that the faith in which they were to be grounded might be a pietistic faith. On the other hand it does seem to me that before Christians can make an effective impact and contribution they must be drawn together and equipped. How is this to be done? May it not be more profitable, even in relation to the "social struggle," to teach them to handle the Bible as a Christian tool and weapon than to lead them in discussions of post-war reconstruction? Perhaps my choice of the word "stalwart" suggested something rather restricted, but I do not regret it, for staunchness is going to be one of the main requirements in the immediate future. But I certainly was not conceiving of the faith as so separate from and irrelevant to the everyday world that to ground people in it would be to leave them unguided for the "social struggle."

Of course, I entirely agree that it would be both fatal and unfaithful for us to let go our sense of responsibility towards the nation. It was partly for that reason that I said that the creation of stalwarts could not and should not be our only concern. But I am not clear that your own definition of a National Church covers all that has usually been intended by the term. It seems to me to be something of a redefinition, which is perhaps what is needed. But I am wondering whether a Church which allows itself to be treated by government departments as one among a number of "voluntary organizations" can properly be regarded as a National Church. On the other hand, if it is to refuse the status of "voluntary organization," on what other terms will it in the conditions of to-day be allowed to participate, as you, Sir, wish it to participate, in undertakings sponsored by the State? Certainly that is the status which is being increasingly accorded to it, and the survival of the outward forms of the Elizabethan Settlement must not be allowed to conceal from us the fact that there is a changed and changing relation. But as to the witness of the Church to the nation there are circumstances in which that can be more effectively given by an Amos than an Amaziah. My fear is lest the preservation of what has to a great extent become a fictional relation to the State may in fact narrow the scope and trammel the freedom of our address to the nation—lest we become a mere poor country cousin to Whitehall. The Province of South Africa has not been less faithful in its national witness than those of Canterbury and York. But at all costs we must preserve our right to be "a church which is more than the sanctification of human ideals" (Niebuhr, *Beyond Tragedy*, p. 60). A penetrating and not unsympathetic Roman Catholic observer has warned us of the danger that the Church of England may come to provide a parallel to the state religion of Rome in the second and third centuries (Johnson, *Anglicanism in Transition*, p. 219). But "a church that is only a tiny, persecuted minority in a vast sea of atheists might still be strong and successful. It would emerge triumphantly as soon as materialism had revealed itself as hollow" (Drucker, *The End of Economic Man*, p. 98). I am not suggesting that we find ourselves in "a vast sea of atheists," but the idea is applicable. Indeed it may be that we must integrate ourselves before we can make any real contribution to the integration of society.

The use of the word "sect" in this connexion is not perhaps entirely disinterested, since it carries with it a measure of stigma. But in any

case frankly to recognize the givenness of the facts of the situation and to strive to become an effective sect may be the only means of preserving Anglicanism from being submerged in a shapeless and vapid syncretism. The alternative may well be to lose a precious flavour, subtly and strangely distilled by the Spirit through our history, in a mere "dilute to taste" Christianity or even—for this is the latest demand—in a shandy of all the religions of the world.

Dr Oldham's letter seems to raise the whole question of the relation of the temporal to the spiritual, the medieval (and indeed age-long) controversy about the "Two Swords." I have a suspicion that this fashionable business of "levels" is largely the old, convenient and dangerous device of departmentalizing everything, dressed up in new clothes, but I entirely agree that the distinction between the theological and political must be preserved. In fact I want to go farther and to preserve it in a state of tension. It has been in periods when this tension has been lost through Erastianism or any other cause that the distinction has become blurred, to the detriment alike of Church and State. But there are times when the tension should be drawn fairly taut, and I believe this to be such a time. In a latitudinarian age—I am thinking of England—when nothing is apt to seem to matter very much, there is a danger of all the tensions being lost, with a consequent loss of both vitality and balance. That is why I said that it is a primary, though by no means, of course, the only, duty of the Church to preserve opposition. To preserve opposition may be necessary for the preservation of the thing opposed. I think too that Dr Oldham has failed to meet my point as to the danger of "British Christianity" being treated as a substitute for "Gospel Christianity." Is not Dr Oldham himself running us into the very temptation from which he would preserve us?

That brings me to the question of totalitarianism. Admittedly to speak, as I have spoken, of a "less thoroughgoing totalitarianism" is a contradiction in terms, but I think that the meaning is reasonably clear and in default of another term I do not see how the idea can be otherwise expressed. To substitute "a planned society" is surely to beg the question—how completely planned? If this terminological exactitude is to be demanded, it is perhaps fair to ask for a definition of "a planned society."

I have a feeling that Mr Thompson suspects me of being defeatist, but in fact I agree most heartily with the note admirably sounded in his letter. A Christian must in times such as these be full of courage and hope, for Christ has promised that "the gates of hell shall not prevail." But it is upon God's promises that our hope must be founded. He is driving us back upon Himself. It is upon God's promises that we must build up our people. There is a type of optimism which is sheer "dope." Let me hasten to say that there is no trace of it in Mr Thompson's letter but it is fairly prevalent in influential ecclesiastical circles. What we in the parishes most need is to be given a line—a line rather than a cut-and-dried policy, but a definite line. Certainly the issues must not be falsely simplified, but a challenge which was a real challenge might have an amazingly revivifying effect and reveal quite unsuspected latent strength. The trouble with most of the "challenges"

has been that they have challenged neither ourselves nor anybody else. They have not been sufficiently bold and definite and they have attuned themselves to the prevailing Pelagianism. We are in need of rallying. I doubt whether many outside the ranks of the parish clergy have yet been brought to understand just how naked the land is. We are told of "parishes where nothing is happening." It is useless to gird at the incumbents. Doubtless there are examples of slackness and ineptitude, but far more often it is a case of a man having lost heart. He feels that he is a failure and this is borne in upon him the more by mainly apocryphal or delusive stories of startling success elsewhere. But if such a one might be brought to see himself as a warrior in a tough struggle, his morale and with it the Christian morale of others with whom he makes contact might well be reinvigorated. I believe that many of my fellow parish priests and not a few of the laity will join me in asking the Church to get to grips with what is, instead of so continually dwelling on what was or issuing reports on what might be.

FRANK BENNETT.

NESTON-IN-WIRRAL.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: J. Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul* (15s.).
A.P.C.K. (Dublin): E. G. Daunt, *When Thou Prayest* (1s.).
THE AUTHOR: J. K. Heydon, *Freewill and Science* (2s. 6d.).
CENTENARY PRESS: G. Vann, *The Heart of Man* (6s.).
JAMES CLARKE: P. Hartill (Ed.), *On Earth Peace* (7s.6d.).
CORK UNIVERSITY PRESS: A. O'Rahilly, *The Burial of Christ* (2s.).
DUCKWORTH: S. Cave, *The Christian Estimate of Man* (6s.).
EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE: S. Dark, *Seven Archbishops* (1s. 6d.).
GREY WALLS PRESS: F. Maman, *The Wounds of the Apostles* (7s. 6d.); F. Maman, W. Gardiner and N. Moore, *Three Poems* (2s. 6d.).
INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: T. C. Hammond, *Reasoning Faith* (5s.).
J. A. JENNINGS (Canterbury): Clew Garnett, *Victory Vision* (1s. 6d.).
KING AND STAPLES: S. L. Bethell, *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition* (10s. 6d.).
MOWBRAYS: H. A. Wilson, *Haggerston Catechism* IV (1s. 9d.); R. Lumb, *The Next Three Years* (1s. 9d.).
NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: A. Chavasse, *Draw Near with Faith* (6d.); P. H. Saunders, *Born King*, 4s.
PAX HOUSE: Ronald Dix, C.F., *One Bread, One Body* (1s.).
S.C.M. PRESS: J. Moffatt, *The Thrill of Tradition* (7s. 6d.); E. Brunner, *The Divine-Human Encounter* (8s. 6d.); Church of Scotland, *Home, Community and Church* (1s. 3d.); D. H. C. Read, *Prisoner's Quest* (6s.); A. T. P. Williams, Bishop of Durham, *Church Union in South India* (6d.).
SHELDON PRESS: P. J. Lamb, *Sons of Adam* (1s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K.: T. G. Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy* (25s.); *The Church and the Land* (4d.); G. W. Butterworth, *Spiritualism and Religion* (9s.); G. Broomfield, *Constitutional Episcopacy* (6d.); W. G. Addison, *Religious Equality in Modern England, 1714-1914* (8s. 6d.); S. Hobhouse, *Christ and Our Enemies* (9d.); F. Darwin, *The English Mediæval Recluse* (6s.); K. A. Esdaile, *St Martin-in-the-Fields, New and Old* (5s.); C. D. Hoste, *The Offering of Nazareth* (2s. 6d.); R. L. G. Wright, *A Book of Words for Padres* (R.A.F.) (5s.); *A Book of Occasional Services* (Australia) (5s.).
UNIVERSITY OF WALES PRESS BOARD: A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (3s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher